

ORIGINAL

Before **DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of)
)
Implementation of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)
)
Telecommunications Carriers' Use of)
Customer Proprietary Network Information)
and Other Customer Information)

CC Docket No. 96-115

RECEIVED

JAN 21 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

To: The Commission

Reply Comments of the
Yellow Pages Publishers Association on
the Petitions for Reconsideration

The Yellow Pages Publishers Association ("YPPA") by its attorneys, hereby submits these reply comments regarding the Petitions for Reconsideration filed in the above captioned proceeding. YPPA is the largest trade association representing the Yellow Pages industry in North America. YPPA members include many Yellow Pages publishers, as well as many other participants in the Yellow Pages industry. YPPA has actively participated in this proceeding on behalf of its members and filed initial comments.

In its comments filed in this proceeding, the Telecommunications Resellers Association (TRA) makes several allegations and assumptions about the directory publishing business.^{1/} Some of these allegations and assumptions are incorrect or

^{1/} TRA makes these comments in support of the Association of Directory Publisher's Petition for Reconsideration asking, in part, for the Commission to reconsider its decision

No. of Copies rec'd 014
List A CODE

misleading. TRA does not accurately characterize the directory publishing business and the relationship between incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) and their publishers.^{2/} Also, what may be true for one ILEC-publisher relationship may not be true for another ILEC-publisher arrangement.

Further TRA suggests that ILECS merely have the option of passing competitive local exchange carriers (CLEC) SLI to their affiliated publishers: "an incumbent LEC, which has no obligation to pass competitive LEC SLI to any entity including its own publishing affiliate..."^{3/} This statement is untrue and completely ignores the fact that the interconnection agreements between ILECs and CLECs usually require that the ILEC publish CLEC listings in the ILEC's telephone book.^{4/} CLECs want their customers to appear in the ILEC's telephone book so others know how to reach the CLEC's customers. Indeed, CLECs would be filing complaints before the Commission if an ILEC failed to publish CLEC listings.

The representations made by TRA are both inaccurate and irrelevant. The statute is clear that each carrier, whether ILEC or CLEC, must provide its own SLI to directory publishers. CLECs are now in the business of providing local telephone

not to require incumbent local exchange carriers to provide competitive local exchange carrier subscriber listing information to directory publishers.

^{2/} For example, TRA assumes that once a customer leaves the ILEC, that the listing is kept in the database. That is not necessarily the case. The listing may be dropped from the database and, when the customer becomes the subscriber of another carrier, the listing may be re-entered, recoded, or may be manipulated in some other way.

^{3/} TRA Comments at p. 7.

^{4/} Under section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii), Bell operating companies (BOCs) are required to offer the CLEC an opportunity to list the CLEC customers in BOC's directory

service. There are certain obligations that come with the business, and provisioning of subscriber listing information (SLI) to directory publishers is one of those obligations. While some ILECs are certainly willing to provide CLEC SLI to all directory publishers, this is a voluntary decision made between the ILEC and the CLEC. If either the CLEC does not permit the ILEC to provide the CLEC's SLI, or the ILEC is unwilling to provide the CLEC SLI, directory publishers will have to obtain the SLI directly from the CLECs. If the CLEC (or an ILEC) is unable or unwilling to provide its own SLI to a directory publisher, the directory publisher can file a complaint with the Commission under section 222(e).

YPPA respectfully requests that the Commission, for the above stated reasons and those stated in its comments in this proceeding, deny the Association of Directory Publisher's Petition for Reconsideration, and grant the Petitions for Reconsideration filed by Alltel, Bell Atlantic, the National Telephone Cooperative Association and US West.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joel Bernstein", written over a horizontal line.

Joel Bernstein
Stephen L. Goodman
Counsel for YPPA

Halprin, Temple, Goodman and Maher
555 12th Street, N.W., Suite 950 North
Washington, DC 20004
(202)371-9100

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Cathy L. McCoy, hereby certify that on this 21st day of January 2000, a copy of the Comments of the Yellow Pages Publishers Association on Petitions for Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 96-115, has been served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, this 21st day of January, 2000 upon the following:


L. Marie Guillory
Daniel Mitchell
National Telephone Cooperative
Association
4121 Wilson Boulevard, 10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203

Kathryn Marie Krause
U S West Communications, Inc.
Suite 700
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Glenn S. Rabin
ALLTEL Services Corporation
Suite 720
601 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

John M. Goodman
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Attorney for Bell Atlantic

Philip L. Verveer
Theodore Whitehouse
Sophie J. Keefer
Willkie Farr & Gallagher
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-3384


Cathy L. McCoy